## REMARKS

During the interview of November 27, 2007, the subject matter of claims 8-9 and 18-19 was discussed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview.

Previously, claims 8-9 and 18-19 were objected to, as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were found otherwise allowable, if amended to include the base claim and any intervening claims. The independent claims 1, 11 and 21 were all amended in accordance with the subject matter of the allowable claims 8 and 18, which were canceled. Moreover, the recited limitations of claims 8 and 18 were amended for antecedent basis within the independent base claims as requested by the Examiner during the interview.

In the office action dated 03 April 2008, the Examiner withdrew the finality of the previous office action dated 27 September 2007. New references were searched and new grounds for rejection were cited. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 11-13, 17, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application 2002/0010917 A1 to Srikantan et al. (Srikantan), in view of United States Patent Application 2005/0283547 A1 to Parry et al. (Parry) and further in view of United States Patent 6,470,319 B1 to Ryan (Ryan). Parry has issued as United States Patent 7,139,868 B2.

Claims 4-6, 14-16 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, Parry and Ryan, and further in view of United States Patent 6,414,725 B1 to Clarin et al. (Clarin).

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, Parry, Ryan and further in view of United States Patent 6,744,967 B2 to Kaminski (Kaminski).

By this amendment, Applicants incorporate the previously discussed amendments to claims 1, 11 and 21, further amend claim 21 for antecedent basis, and add new claims 22-23 dependent on claim 21. Claims 8 and 18 were previously canceled as incorporated into independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Accordingly, claims 1-7, 9-17 and 19-23 will remain pending in the application upon entry

of this amendment.

I.    Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-10

Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, in view of Parry and further in view of Ryan. Claims 4-6 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, Parry and Ryan, and further in view of Clarin. Claim 10 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, Parry, Ryan and further in view of Kaminski. Claims 2-7 and 9-10 are dependent on claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method for recording media. The method receives at least one media stream and stores at least a portion of the media stream in at least one personal video recording ("PVR") media server. The storing comprises buffering the media stream and maintaining a write position for the buffering. The method couples several clients that are capable of displaying the media stream, to the PVR media server. The method generates a first buffer position to identify a location within the media stream for playback of the media stream at a first client and generates a second buffer position to identify a location within the media stream for playback of the media stream at a second client. The second buffer position is independent from the first buffer position. The method receives input from a first user at the first client to select a buffer position of another client and displays, at the first client, a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for the media stream. The method receives input from the first user to select the second buffer position, and transfers the media stream to the first client, so as to deliver the media stream by using the selected second buffer position of the second client.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. As stated within the office action, Srikantan and Parry do not teach displaying, at a

first client, a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for the media stream, as recited by claim 1.
Applicants further submit that Ryan at column 6, line 57, describes retrieving the records of criminal offenders (Ryan's "clients") from a database maintained by a criminal corrections facility. Hence, Ryan's clients do not display a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for a media stream, do not display a media stream, and are not coupled to a PVR-media server.

Accordingly, the cited references and their combination do not disclose, teach, or even suggest each and every element of claim 1. Since claims 2-7 and 9-10 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-20.

II.    Rejection of Claims 11-17 and 19-20

Claims 11-13, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, in view of Parry and further in view of Ryan. Claims 14-16 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, Parry and Ryan, and further in view of Clarin. Claim 20 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, Parry, Ryan and further in view of Kaminski. Claims 12-17 and 19-20 are dependent on claim 11.

Claim 11 recites a PVR-media server that has at least one input for receiving at least one media stream, and a storage medium for storing at least a portion of the media stream. The storage medium is configured for buffering the media stream, and the PVR-media server is configured for maintaining a write position for the buffering. The PVR media server also has at least one output for coupling several clients to the PVR media server. The clients are capable of displaying the media stream. The PVR-media server is for generating a first buffer position to identify a location within

the media stream for a first client, and for generating a second buffer position to identify a location within the media stream for a second client. The second buffer position is independent from the first buffer position. The PVR-media server is further configured for receiving input from a first user at a first client to select a buffer position of another client, and for displaying, at the first client, a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for the media stream. The PVR media server is also configured for receiving input from the first user to select the second buffer position, and for transferring the media stream to the first client, so as to deliver the media stream by using the selected second buffer position of the second client.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a PVR media server. As stated within the office action, Srikantan and Parry do not teach displaying, at a first client, a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for the media stream, as recited by claim 11. Applicants further submit that Ryan at column 6, line 57, describes retrieving the records of criminal offenders (Ryan's "clients") from a database maintained by a criminal corrections facility. Hence, Ryan's clients do not display a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for a media stream, do not display a media stream, and are not coupled to a PVR-media server.

Accordingly, the cited references and their combination do not disclose, teach, or even suggest each and every element of claim 11. Since claims 12-17 and 19-20 are dependent on claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 11. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 11-17 and 19-20.

III.     Rejection of Claim 21

Claim 21 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srikantan, in view of Parry and further in view of Ryan.

Claim 21 recites a system for presenting a media stream. The system includes several clients that are coupled to a first PVR media server. The clients are for displaying the media stream. The first PVR-media server has an input, a storage medium, and a media controller. The input is for receiving at least one media stream. The storage medium is for storing at least a portion of the media stream. The storage medium is configured for buffering the media stream. The first PVR media server is configured for maintaining a write position for the buffering. The media controller is for generating a first buffer position to identify a location within the media stream for a first client and for generating a second buffer position to identify a location within the media stream for a second client. The second buffer position is independent from the first buffer position. The system also includes a network for coupling the first PVR-media server to the clients, for delivering the media stream to a first client by using the first buffer position, and for delivering the media stream to a second client by using the second buffer position. The first PVR-media server is further configured for receiving input from a first user at the first client to select a buffer position of another client, and for displaying, at the first client, a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for the media stream. The first PVR media server is also configured for receiving input from the first user to select the second buffer position, and for transferring the media stream to the first client, so as to deliver the media stream by using the selected second buffer position of the second client.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a system. As stated within the office action, Srikantan and Parry do not teach displaying, at a first client, a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for the media stream, as

recited by claim 21. Applicants further submit that Ryan at column 6, line 57, describes retrieving the records of criminal offenders (Ryan's "clients") from a database maintained by a criminal corrections facility. Hence, Ryan's clients do not display a list of clients that maintain a buffer position for a media stream, do not display a media stream, and are not coupled to a PVR media server. Accordingly, the cited references and their combination do not disclose, teach, or even suggest each and every element of claim 21. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claim 21.

New claims 22-23

Applicant adds new claims 22-23 that are dependent on claim 21. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 22-23 merely clarify some of the claimed embodiments, and further are not disclosed by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 21.

# CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER | SUH, P.C.

Dated: May 14, 2008

/Andy Pho/ #48,862

Andy T. Pho
Reg. No. 48,862

Stattler | Suh, Professional Corporation
60 South Market Street, Suite 480
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone:   (408) 881-0140 x102
Fax:       (408) 881-0145